

### **REMARKS**

This Amendment is responsive to the non-final Office Action mailed on November 3, 2005. Claims 1-20 are pending before this Amendment, claims 9-13 and 20 are withdrawn, claims 2 and 14 have been cancelled, and claims 1, 3-13, and 15-20 have been amended. Claims 34-53 are new. Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 14-16, 18 and 19. In view of the foregoing amendments, as well as the following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in complete condition for allowance and request reconsideration of the application in this regard.

### **Objections**

The abstract of the disclosure stands objected to as non-descriptive. Applicant has amended the abstract of the disclosure to be more descriptive of the device. A copy of the abstract of the disclosure is attached on a separate sheet.

Claims 2 and 15 stand objected to because of informalities. Claim 2 is cancelled. Claim 15 has been amended to provide proper antecedent basis for the offending phrase by changing "said plurality of semiconductor devices" to "said plurality of semiconductor device structures."

### **Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 2, 4, and 17 stand rejected for failing to particularly point out and claim the subject matter Applicants regard as the invention. Claim 2 has been cancelled. Claim 4 has been amended to set forth "a plurality of locations," as suggested by the Examiner. Claim 17 has been amended to set forth "said gate electrode of each of said plurality of semiconductor devices," as suggested by the Examiner. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Page 11 of 13  
Serial No. 10/777,576  
Amendment and Response dated January 18, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of November 3, 2005  
IBM Docket ROC920030271US1  
WH&E IBM/272  
K:\ibmt\272\Response to 110305 Office Action.wpd

**Rejections of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Roesner et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0132461), hereinafter *Roesner*. Of these claims, claim 1 is the only independent claim. Applicants have elected to amend independent claim 1 by introducing the subject matter of original claim 14, which the Examiner considered to be allowable. Claims 2-8 depend from independent claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

**Rejoinder of Withdrawn Claims**

Applicants believe that currently withdrawn claims 9-13 and 20 are eligible for rejoinder. Generic claim 14, whose subject matter was added to claim 1, is allowable. Claims 9-13 and 20, which depend from claim 1, are written in dependent form and require all the limitations of claim 1. Hence, Applicants request that the Examiner rejoin claims 9-13 and 20 and fully examine claims 9-13 and 20 for patentability.

**New Claims**

Claims 34-42, which are new, depend from a patentable independent claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Furthermore, these claims each recite a unique combination of elements not disclosed or suggested by the references of record. In particular, support for claims 34 and 37 is found at page 8, line 15 of Applicants' written description.

Independent claim 43 and dependent claims 44-53 are new. Claim 43 is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. However, claim 43 does not require the semiconductor device structures to be arranged in an array characterized by a plurality of rows and a plurality of columns. Claims 44-53 are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 43. Furthermore, each these claims recites a unique combination of elements not disclosed or suggested by the references of record.

Page 12 of 13  
Serial No. 10/777,576  
Amendment and Response dated January 18, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of November 3, 2005  
IBM Docket ROC920030271US1  
WH&E IBM/272  
K:\ibm\272\Response to 110305 Office Action.wpd

**Conclusion**

Applicants have made a bona fide effort to respond to each and every requirement set forth in the Office Action. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is submitted to be in complete condition for allowance and, accordingly, a timely notice of allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited. In the event that any issues remain outstanding, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to expedite issuance of this application.

Applicants do not believe fees are dues in connection with filing this communication other than the excess claims fee. If, however, any additional fees are necessary as a result of this communication, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any under-payment or fees associated with this communication or credit any over-payment to Deposit Account No. 23-3000.

Respectfully submitted,

18 January 2006  
Date

William R. Allen  
William R. Allen, Ph.D.  
Reg. No. 48,389  
WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, L.L.P.  
2700 Carew Tower  
441 Vine Street  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202  
Telephone: (513) 241-2324  
Facsimile: (513) 241-6234

**Attachment**

Page 13 of 13  
Serial No. 10/777,576  
Amendment and Response dated January 18, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of November 3, 2005  
IBM Docket ROC920030271US1  
WH&E IBM/272  
K:\hnm\272\Response to 110305 Office Action.wpd